

REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated December 8, 2004, and have made amendments to the claims. Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 8-10 have been amended. Claims 11-15 have been added. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 09014804 A to Daikin Kogyo ("Daikin Kogyo"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated by the Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 7 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Following the Examiner's suggestion, the limitations of original claim 7 have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 10. As amended, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 10 are now allowable over Daikin Kogyo. Furthermore, because claims 2-6 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, it is also submitted that claims 2-6 and are now allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8 and 9 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. With this amendment, claims 8 and 9 have been rewritten in independent form and include all of the limitations of their base claim (original claim 1). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 9 be allowed.

New Claims 11-15

It is respectfully submitted that new independent claim 11 be allowed because the limitations of amended claim 1, determined to be allowable by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action, are recited in new independent claim 11. Furthermore, because claims 12-15 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 11, it is further submitted that these claims are also allowable

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: March 2, 2005

By: Lew Macapagal
Lew Edward V. Macapagal
Registration No. 55,416
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: 213-623-2221
Facsimile: 213-623-2211